

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully solicited.

Claims 1, 19, 30, 34, and 35 are pending, with Claims 1 and 19 being independent.

Claims 3, 21, and 33 have been cancelled without prejudice. Claims 1, 19, 34, and 35 have been amended.

Claims 1, 3, 19, 21, 30, and 33 through 35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over previously-cited US 2006/0136965 A1 (Ellis, et al.) in view of newly-cited US 6,177,931 B1 (Alexander, et al.). All rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 1 and 19 variously recite, *inter alia*, inputting (a) booking information, (b) booking cancellation information, and (c) recording end information, with deleting the booking information when the booking cancellation information is inputted, and updating the user profile based on the booking information and the recording end information when the booking cancellation information is not inputted, and updating the user profile without the booking information when the booking cancellation information is inputted.

However, Applicants respectfully submit that neither Ellis, et al. nor Alexander, et al., even in the proposed combination, assuming, *arguendo*, that the documents could be combined, discloses or suggests at least the above-discussed claimed features as recited, *inter alia*, in Claims 1 and 19.

Applicants respectfully submit that Ellis, et al. discloses, e.g., that the “program guide client may track when users order pay-per-view programs, record programs and schedule reminders for programs, and may also provide this information to program guide server 25 as part of the viewing histories” (e.g., [0107]), and that user defined expressions may be stored for

searching through program guide data, and criteria may be derived from user profiles (e.g., [0077])).

However, Applicants respectfully submit that Ellis, et al. is completely devoid of any mention of at least the above-discussed claimed features as recited, *inter alia*, in Claims 1 and 19. In this regard, the Official Action acknowledges at page 3 that Ellis, et al. “is silent about updating the user profile if booking for recording is not canceled in said recording apparatus, and not updating the user profile when the booking is canceled in said recording apparatus”. Applicants wish to point out that, indeed, Ellis, et al. contains no disclosure whatsoever of inputting, from the recording apparatus, booking cancellation information, and deleting the booking information when the booking cancellation information is input, let alone the above-discussed claimed features as recited, *inter alia*, in Claims 1 and 19. In this regard, the assertion at the bottom of page 3 of the Official Action that Ellis, et al. discloses the claimed booking cancellation information is respectfully traversed as being without support in the cited document.

Meanwhile, Applicants respectfully submit that Alexander, et al. fails to remedy Ellis, et al.’s deficiencies. Applicants respectfully submit that Alexander, et al. discloses, e.g., a profile program accumulating, among other things, the number of times that the viewer interacted with the PEG, performed various types of interactions with the EPG, watched a particular channel, interacted with the Internet, interacted with a particular website, watched and/or recorded and/or scheduled to watch a program, the duration of viewing, etc. (e.g., col. 29, lines 30 et seq.). However, Applicants respectfully submit that such also provides neither a description nor a suggestion of at least the above-discussed claimed features as recited, *inter alia*, in Claims 1 and 19. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that even if the documents could be combined, *arguendo*, the combination would lack any disclosure or suggestion of at least such features.

Also, the statement in the Official Action that certain features are well known is respectfully traversed in the absence of a cited reference. MPEP 2144.03.

Also, Applicants respectfully submit that there has been no showing of any indication of motivation in the cited documents that would lead the artisan to attempt to arrive at such features.

The dependent claims are also submitted to be patentable because they set forth additional aspects of the present invention and are dependent from independent claims discussed above. Therefore, separate and individual consideration of each dependent claim is respectfully requested.

Applicants submit that this application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Daniel S. Glueck/
Daniel S. Glueck
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 37,838

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200
DSGjlr

FCIS_WS 2439723v1